

III. REMARKS

Specification Amendments

Amendments were made to the specification to identify trademarks. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-27 were pending in the present application and are canceled herein. New claim 28 is added. Consideration of the new claim is respectfully requested.

In this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-27 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-27 prior to cancellation is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-27 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of new claim 28.

Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims including the subject matter encompassed by cancelled claims 1-27, and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. In light of the cancellation of claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 26 and 27, these rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. In light of the cancellation of claims 10-18, these rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Claims 1, 10, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (US 6,336,122). In light of the cancellation of claims 1, 10 and 19, these rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 10-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Narayanaswamy (US 7,069,553). In light of the cancellation of claims 2-9, 11-18, and 10-27, these rejections are now moot.

Discussion of New Claim 28

New claim 28 requires *inter alia* “creating a single web application archive file for use by both the first module and the second module, wherein the single web application archive file comprises: the independent resources; and the related resource, wherein the related resource includes the information in the copy of the related resource in the first module that conflicts with the information in the copy of the related sources in the second module, but not the information in the copy of the related resource in the second module.” To any extent that the Examiner alleges this feature of the claim is taught by Narayanaswamy in cols. 15-16 (cited by the Examiner in the rejections of claims 7, 16, and 25 at page 11 of the Office Action), Applicants disagree. First, the information in the copy of the related resource in the first module was developed by a first team independently of a second team that developed the second module. Narayanaswamy contemplates “a user,” not two independent teams. Narayanaswamy 16:17-63. Second, Narayanaswamy does not teach creating a single web application file containing both independent resources and a related resource, wherein the related resource has information developed by the first development team but by the second development team. Narayanaswamy does not discuss independent development teams developing independent modules at all. This feature is an advantage of the present invention because it allows independent modules to use a single web application archive, thus conserving runtime resources. Par. [0003], lines 5-11. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that new claim 28 be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2800
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4660
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com